981/6

NEWARK PUBLIC LIBRARY

SEP 10 1981

U. S. GOVT. PUBS.
DEPOSITORY 376

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services | Social Security Administration | Office of Policy | Office of Research and Statistics

research and statistics note

NOTE NO. 6
AUGUST 28, 1981

RACE AND ETHNIC DATA COLLECTION ON SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER APPLICATIONS*

INTRODUCTION

Since its inception, the Social Security Administration (SSA) has collected data on race that were originally used to aid in identification. The data are now used solely for statistical purposes, often combined with other information derived from reporting and informational forms used in administering the Social Security program. Such data have been studied by SSA to determine the effects of the program on major race groups and to predict future trends and effects of possible program changes. Nonprogram-related statistical uses have included examinations of the data for possible civil rights violations and studies related to changes in workforce structure and to trends in public health (such as the relationship of disease and mortality rates in various work environments to those of particular race groups). The race information is provided in summary or unidentifiable form in SSA statistical publications, or in individual form only to other Federal statistical components which can assure that their statistical results will be presented exclusively in anonymous form.[1]

The race data are collected primarily through the application process when the individual first completes the "Application for a Social Security Number Card" (Form SS-5) and at subsequent times if the need arises for a duplicate or corrected card (such as one necessitated by a name change due to marriage).

In 1979, approximately 12 million applications were submitted either by mail or in person at one of 1,300 district offices around the country. Though most applicants may apply in person or by mail, those first-time applicants over age 17 or aliens whose immigration papers must not be mailed are required to apply in person.

Unlike most information requested on the SS-5, response to the race item is voluntary and failure to respond will not affect the issuance of a social security number. Notification of the nonmandatory nature of the race question, as well as an explanation of the purpose and uses of such data by SSA, have been given to applicants since passage of the Privacy Act of 1974.

In 1978, the Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards (OFSPS) moved to standardize the categories used by government agencies in the collection of race and ethnic data. The directive outlining this policy (Directive No. 15, "Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting") established five race and ethnic categories which would be the minimum acceptable. These were:

*By William J. Nelson, Jr., Division of OASDI Statistics. The author wishes to acknowledge the work of Marvin G. Scherr, Thomas B. Jabine, and Frederick Scheuren. This note expands "Collection and Analysis of Data on Race and Ethnicity Questions in Social Security Number Applications," a paper presented to the American Statistical Association in August 1980 and co-authored by Marvin G. Scherr and William J. Nelson, Jr.

[1] "The Collection by the Social Security Administration of Data on Race and Ethnicity for Use in Statistical Analysis and Research," SSA Program Circular No. 420, Aug. 14, 1978.

HE 3.28/2:

1. American Indian or Alaska Native
2. Asian or Pacific Islander
3. Black (not of Hispanic origin)
4. Hispanic
5. White (not of Hispanic origin).

Each agency had the option of collecting the data through the use of a combined race/ethnic format (as above) or by separate questions on race and ethnicity, provided that the collected data were reducible to these five categories.

Because the SS-5 then in use requested race data on only three categories—white, black, other—changes had to be made in the question format. However, such changes had to be considered carefully. The SS-5 was important not only because it was the sole SSA administrative record being used to collect race data but also because it was one of the most widely used of all government applications. The high usage required that terminology be accurate and clear to minimize confusion and the likelihood of applicant nonresponse. High levels of nonresponse could not be tolerated due to loss of data integrity and the resulting followup which would be required by district office personnel to obtain the missing information. The nonresponse rate had become more of a concern in recent years as 3.6 percent of first-time applicants omitted the race item in 1979, double the rate of 1969.

DESIGN OF OPERATIONAL PRETEST

With the above concerns in mind and given the latitude in choosing a format, SSA evaluated several options. These options were initially examined through pretests using focus group interviews in which potential applicants completed test applications and discussed their reactions to the formats and the questions.[2] As a result of these interviews and subsequent discussions with OFSPS and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), an *operational* pretest was scheduled. Its purpose was to field test two approaches to requesting race/ethnic data—one utilized a one-question format based on the minimum acceptable categories proposed by OFSPS; the other, a two-question format with race and ethnic questions separated.

Also a part of the pretest was a need to evaluate use of the word "voluntary" on the form itself, following the race/ethnic question. Though such notification was supplied in the test form instructions, OMB felt that use of the word on the form itself would further increase applicant awareness. Realizing that "there is a delicate balance in preserving the voluntary nature of the answer without endangering high response rate,"[3] the word "voluntary" was placed on half the forms so that its impact could be evaluated.

The resulting experimental design then consisted of a test in which a one-question approach with "voluntary" and a one-question approach without "voluntary" were compared and contrasted with a two-question approach with "voluntary" and a two-question approach without "voluntary." The formats of the two approaches to be tested appear below.

One-question approach

ARE YOU (Voluntary) (Check one only):

☐ Asian, Asian-American or Pacific Islander (Includes persons of Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Samoan, etc., ancestry or descent)?

☐ Hispanic (Includes persons of Chicano, Cuban, Mexican, or Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish ancestry or descent)?

☐ Negro or Black (not Hispanic)?

☐ North American Indian or Alaskan Native?

☐ White (not Hispanic)?

[2] Marvin G. Scherr, "The Use of Focus Group Interviews to Improve the Design of an Administrative Form: A Case Study at the Social Security Administration," 1980 Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Survey Research Methods Section.

[3] Lois Alexander, "Legal Policy Issues in the Collection of Race/Ethnic Data on Form SS-5," 1980 Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Survey Research Methods Section.

READEX FICHE best copy available

Two-question approach[4]

RACE (Voluntary) (Check one only):

☐ White

☐ Black or Negro

☐ Other (Specify)

ARE YOU (Voluntary) (Check one only):

☐ Asian, Asian-American, or Pacific Islander (Includes persons of Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Samoan, etc., ancestry or descent)?

☐ Hispanic (Includes persons of Chicano, Cuban, Mexican, or Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish ancestry or descent)?

☐ North American Indian or Alaskan Native?

☐ None of these?

The remaining two versions were identical to those above except that they did not contain the word "voluntary" in the item label.

Objectives

In conducting the operational pretest, there were several objectives:

- Evaluate the two approaches to request race/ethnic information and determine which provided more complete data;
- Evaluate the effects of using the word "voluntary" on the form;
- Examine the effectiveness of in-person editing and followup questioning; and
- Finalize the format, content, and instructions related to the race/ethnic question(s) in preparation for full nationwide use.

Sample Population and Test Sites

The sample was designed by selecting those locations which would provide for testing the applications among individuals from major race/ethnic groups and subgroups. The greatest concentration was placed on those segments of the population believed to be the most difficult to enumerate as indicated by the Bureau of the Census and by SSA focus group experience.

For example, to better evaluate the Hispanic group, several areas were selected: Los Angeles for Mexican-Americans and Chicanos, Miami for Cubans, and New York for Puerto Ricans. District offices in downtown Los Angeles, California, and in Brooklyn, New York, were selected for half the study cases, not only because of their high concentrations of Hispanics and other minority groups, but also because of the high daily volume of applications completed.

Ten other offices were chosen to provide applicants varying in urban/rural residence and socioeconomic status within major race/ethnic groups and subgroups (table 1).

Due to time and processing constraints, the test was limited to samples targeted at 1,500 for each of the four test versions.

Procedures

Within each district office involved in the pretest, a Social Security number application was given to individuals who requested a Social Security card, planned to complete an application in the office, and had in their possession the proper evidence to identify the applicant and confirm date of birth and citizenship.

In many cases the applicant himself completed the application, but in others a relative, guardian, or sponsor completed it on his behalf.[5]

Applicants at each district office were systematically assigned one of the four test versions, sequenced to ensure that approximately equal numbers of each

---

[4] On the SS-5 test form, the two questions were separated by a question requesting the applicant's sex.

[5] Among all first-time applicants in 1979, more than 20 percent were under age 2, 35 percent were under age 6.

TABLE 1.—Sample design for operational pretest

Site of district office	Characteristics of population	Number of cases	
		Targeted	Received
(1) Los Angeles, California (Downtown)	Hispanics (Mexican Americans, Chicanos), Asians, blacks; low/moderate socioeconomic status; urban West	1,500	1,428
(2) New York, New York (Boro Hall, Brooklyn)	Hispanics (Puerto Ricans), blacks, racially mixed groups; urban Northeast	1,500	1,350
(3) Chicago, Illinois (Loop)	Whites (ethnics); low/moderate socioeconomic status; urban Midwest	500	508
(4) Honolulu, Hawaii	Racially mixed groups, Asian-Americans; low/moderate/high socioeconomic status; West	400	385
(5) Boston, Massachusetts (Cambridge)	Whites; moderate/high socioeconomic status; Northeast	300	311
(6) Houston, Texas (Southwest)	Blacks; moderate/high socioeconomic status; urban Southwest	300	320
(7) Meridian, Mississippi	Blacks, whites; low/ moderate socioeconomic status; rural South	300	219
(8) Miami, Florida (Hialeah)	Hispanics (Cubans); low/ moderate/high socioeconomic status; urban Southeast	300	287
(9) Santa Fe, New Mexico	Near Indian reservation; Southwest	300	278
(10) Seattle, Washington (Bellevue)	Whites; moderate/high socioeconomic status; Northwest	300	301
(11) Camp Springs, Maryland	Whites; moderate/high socioeconomic status; surburban East	150	146
(12) Rockville, Maryland	Whites; moderate/high socioeconomic status; surburban East	150	189

version were completed. The applicant was then instructed to complete the form and return it to the interviewer. On completion, the interviewer reviewed each item on the form and followed up on those which had been omitted or answered incorrectly.

The interviewer then recorded three pieces of information—the applicant's *initial* and *final* response to the race/ethnic question(s) and his (the interviewer's) *impression* of the applicant's race and ethnic background. The initial response was the applicant's preedited response to the race/ethnic question(s) (that is, before any clarification or followup was provided). The response provided after this review and followup process was recorded as the applicant's final response. In most cases, both the initial and final responses were the same. Last, the interviewer provided his impression, primarily to indicate the likely race/ethnic background of nonrespondents.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Applicant Profile

Aside from requesting data on the applicant's race/ethnic background, each of the four test versions collected information on age, sex, citizenship, place of birth, and parents' names. As the data in table 2 indicate, the majority of the pretest applicants were female (53 percent) and the largest age cohort was 20-29 (28 percent), in part reflecting the increased need for a corrected card resulting from a name change. Additionally, one of every three applicants was an alien, ranging from half of all applicants in the Los Angeles office to less than 2 percent of those in Meridian, Mississippi. Although about half (51 percent) of the one-question respondents were first-time applicants, this distribution varied widely among the race/ethnic backgrounds (table 3). Simi-

TABLE 2.—Age and sex of pretest applicants

Age	Total		Female		Male	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	5,723	100.0	3,013	100.0	2,710	100.0
Under 10	1,186	20.7	569	18.9	617	22.8
10-19	1,332	23.3	684	22.7	648	23.9
20-29	1,608	28.1	922	30.6	686	25.3
30-39	799	14.0	405	13.4	394	14.5
40-49	368	6.4	199	6.6	169	6.2
50-59	271	4.7	143	4.8	128	4.7
60-69	129	2.3	71	2.4	58	2.1
70 and over	26	.5	18	.6	8	.3
Unknown	4	.1	2	.1	2	.1

TABLE 3.—Type of card requested by pretest applicants, identified by final race/ethnic response on one-question approach

Race/ethnic category	Total	Type of card requested		
		Original	Duplicate	Correction
Total number	[1]2,882	1,455	1,051	370
Total percent	100	50.7	36.5	12.8
Asian	100	85.0	7.6	7.4
Hispanic	100	50.1	37.8	12.1
Black (not Hispanic)	100	27.4	63.3	9.2
Indian	100	35.0	55.0	10.0
White (not Hispanic)	100	47.7	32.2	20.1
Nonresponse	100	50.9	41.8	7.3

[1]Includes six applicants for whom type of card was not recorded.

lar distributions were noted among two-question respondents.

Conclusions From Race/Ethnic Responses

The operational pretest results for all 12 district offices are summarized in table 4. From these summarized results, several conclusions can be reached.

(1) *Differences in response rates between the one- and two-question approaches were mixed.* Although both initial and final response rates were lower on the one-question than on the race portion of the two-question format, they were considerably higher than the response rates to the ethnic portion of the two-question format. There are a number of reasons for the varying levels of final response which ranged from a high of 99 percent on the separate race question to less than 94 percent on the separate ethnic question. The most apparent one was the high familiarity of the white-black-other race choices in the two-question approach. These categories, which have been used by SSA since its beginnings, have been used widely throughout government.

However, though applicant response to the race question was quite high, more than 13 percent of those who did indicate "other" as their final response failed to specify the race as requested on the form. Much of this nonresponse can be attributed to a lack of clear perception by applicants as to the appropriate response. This difficulty can be il-

TABLE 4.—Applicants' responses to race and ethnic questions

Type of approach	Initial responses				Final responses			
	With "voluntary"		Without "voluntary"		With "voluntary"		Without "voluntary"	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
One question								
Total	1,485	100.0	1,397	100.0	1,485	100.0	1,397	100.0
Asian	257	17.3	247	17.7	284	19.1	268	19.2
Hispanic	340	22.9	332	23.8	374	25.2	343	24.6
Black (not Hispanic)	305	20.5	304	21.8	331	22.3	339	24.3
Indian	14	.9	7	.5	13	.9	7	.5
White (not Hispanic)	395	26.6	404	28.9	432	29.1	419	30.0
Nonresponse	150	10.1	80	5.7	42	2.8	13	.9
Other error	24	1.6	23	1.6	9	.6	8	.6
Two question								
Total	1,461	100.0	1,379	100.0	1,461	100.0	1,379	100.0
Race:								
White	651	44.6	600	43.5	655	44.8	610	44.2
Black	311	21.3	304	22.0	323	22.1	311	22.6
Other	390	26.7	369	26.8	452	30.9	442	32.1
Nonresponse	71	4.9	70	5.1	13	.9	10	.7
Other error	38	2.6	36	2.6	18	1.2	6	.4
Ethnicity:								
Asian	253	17.3	242	17.5	280	19.2	277	20.1
Hispanic	352	24.1	343	24.9	386	26.4	373	27.1
Indian	5	.3	7	.5	6	.4	8	.6
None of these	480	32.9	480	34.8	655	44.8	649	47.1
Nonresponse	317	21.7	262	19.0	115	7.9	58	4.2
Other error	54	3.7	45	3.3	19	1.3	14	1.0

lustrated by using the results from the Los Angeles district office where 36 different responses were provided by those who had indicated "other" as their race. There was no uniformity of response as some referred to color such as yellow or brown and others referred to specific nationality such as Japanese, Mexican, Malayasian, Nicaraguan, etc.

Confusion among whites and blacks also existed. Many such applicants, after responding to the race question, felt that an ethnic response was unnecessary when the appropriate response was "none of these." There were others who considered the "none of these" category to be a nonidentity and objected to being classified as such. Consequently, they too chose not to respond. However, because much of this nonresponse was eliminated following interviewer assistance, the structure of the question itself appeared to be the major problem.

(2) *The word "voluntary" had a varied effect on the rate of response.* On the one-question approach, an initial nonresponse rate of 10.1 percent among applicants using the form with the word "voluntary" was significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) than the 5.7-percent nonresponse rate among those using forms without the word "voluntary." Although this difference was noticeable among all major race/ethnic groups, it appeared that some (whites and Hispanics for example) were much more likely to be nonrespondents when the form contained the word "voluntary" than when it did not (table 5).

The influence of "voluntary" on initial responses to the two-question approach was not significant. On the race item, the word "voluntary" had a reverse although insignificant effect on the response rate (4.9 percent nonresponse with "voluntary," 5.1 percent without "voluntary" on the form).

Similarly, those who initially did not respond to the ethnic question in the two-question approach appeared unaffected by the presence of "voluntary" on the form (21.7 percent nonresponse with "voluntary," 19.0 percent without "voluntary").

TABLE 5.—Percent of initial nonrespondents to combined race/ethnic question as identified by interviewer impression

Race/ethnic category	One-question format	
	With "voluntary"	Without "voluntary"
Asian	10.1	8.9
Hispanic	6.1	2.6
Black	10.8	7.9
Indian	0	0
White	11.1	3.5

(3) *Interviewer intervention was effective in increasing response to the race/ethnic question(s).* Interviewer intervention, consisting of the editing and followup provided after the initial response and leading to the applicant's final response, was effective in raising response levels on both the one-question and two-question approaches. Among applicants using the one-question application, response rates were increased from 92 percent to more than 98 percent after interviewer assistance. Similarly, on the two-question approach, response rates were increased from 95 percent to more than 99 percent on the race question and from less than 80 percent to about 94 percent on the ethnic question.

The followup increased responses by about 10 percent among Asians and blacks, and by about 7 percent among Hispanics and whites. An increased number of responses to the race question were also obtained as a result of interviewer followup. Although gains were more modest, followup was credited with increasing self-identification among whites by 1 percent and blacks by 3 percent. Similarly, on the ethnic part of the two-question approach, interviewer followup increased the recorded response level among Asians by 13 percent and Hispanics by 9 percent. The number of applicants responding "none of these" jumped by 36 percent.

(4) *Nonresponse was generally highest among blacks and lowest among Hispanics.*[b] As the data in table 6 indicate, blacks account for 23.4 percent of all one-question initial respondents, but 31.0 percent of nonrespondents. Similarly, interviewers identified 40 percent of final nonrespondents (refusals) as black although less than 24 percent of the final respondents were black. Both initial and final nonresponse differences were statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

On the other hand, Hispanics comprised nearly 26 percent of all one-question respondents but only 14.5 percent of initial nonrespondents and 17.8 percent of final nonrespondents. However, many Hispanics were unable to read English (especially in Los Angeles where more than half of all test applicants were Hispanic) which required interviewers to complete the application for the individual. This tended to encourage response and thus depress nonresponse rates.

Marked response differences between the race and ethnic questions occurred among the two-question respondents. This was highlighted by the degree to which whites and blacks responded to the race item but did not respond to the ethnic item. Some of the reasons for this difference were examined in conclusion 1, above. On the other hand, those who were neither white not black had considerably less difficulty with the ethnic response than with the race response.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the study results, SSA made several recommendations to OMB and OFSPS regarding the race/ethnic question.

(1) *Use the one-question approach.* There were several reasons for recommending use of the one-question approach. Initial nonresponse was considerably higher (20.4 percent) on the ethnic part but lower on the race part (5.0 percent) of the two-question form than nonresponse to the one-question form (8.0 percent). However, 23.5 percent of all two-question applicants omitted either the race

[b] As measured by interviewer impression of one-question respondents.

TABLE 6.—Race/ethnic background of respondents and nonrespondents

Type of approach	Respondents				Nonrespondents[1]			
	Initial		Final		Initial		Final	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
One question								
Total	2,605	100.0	2,810	100.0	200	100.0	45	100.0
Asian	504	19.3	552	19.6	50	25.0	6	13.3
Hispanic	672	25.8	717	25.5	29	14.5	8	17.8
Black (not Hispanic)	609	23.4	670	23.8	62	31.0	18	40.0
Indian	21	.8	20	.7	0	0	0	0
White (not Hispanic)	799	30.7	851	30.3	59	29.5	13	28.9
Two question								
Race, total	2,625	100.0	2,793	100.0	122	100.0	19	100.0
White	1,251	47.7	1,265	45.3	17	13.9	5	26.3
Black	615	23.4	634	22.7	10	8.2	3	15.8
Other	759	28.9	894	32.0	95	77.9	11	57.9
Ethnicity, total	2,162	100.0	2,634	100.0	497	100.0	122	100.0
Asian	495	22.9	557	21.1	62	12.5	2	1.6
Hispanic	695	32.1	759	28.8	47	9.5	6	4.9
Indian	12	.6	14	.5	2	.4	1	.8
None of these	960	44.4	1,304	49.5	386	77.7	113	92.6

[1] Identified by interviewer.

or the ethnic response. It was therefore apparent that the two-question approach using single questions on race and ethnic background was much more likely to result in applicant nonresponse than the one-question approach. In addition, to the extent that each nonresponse would require in-person or telephone followup from district office personnel, the resulting increase in workload would not be acceptable. Furthermore, each followup question increases the likelihood of an adverse reaction from the applicant. Although the effect of such reaction cannot be measured, it is important to reduce the possibility of its occurrence whenever possible.

Additionally, at the outset of the study, OMB had expressed concern that the two-question approach would require more space on the application form and longer response time by applicants. Although the extra time is not a concern on an individual basis, it becomes an issue when considering the 12 million forms that are completed annually. In recommending the combined one-question approach, SSA addressed and eliminated these OMB concerns.

(2) *Use the word "voluntary" on the application.* As stated earlier, the instructions on all applications indicated that completing the race/ethnic item was voluntary. When the word "voluntary" also appeared, the nonresponse rate to the one-question form was significantly higher than when "voluntary" did not appear. Though such data argue against the additional notification, SSA believed that clear compliance with the Privacy Act was a more compelling reason for its inclusion.

(3) *Change the item format.* In finalizing the item format for nationwide use, two changes were made in the question heading. As a result of pretest findings related to item clarity, SSA recommended that the label for the race/ethnic question be changed from

ARE YOU (Voluntary) (Check one only)

to

RACE/ETHNIC DESCRIPTION (Check one only)
(Voluntary)

Although this change provides increased clarity and consistency with other items on the form, it is impossible to predict any effect it may have on the response rate.

(4) *Monitor the operational results.* Although the limited field test did provide direction in the design of the new Form SS-5, the primary question is whether the results are representative of those which will be obtained under full nationwide use. Affecting the response to this question will be inclusion of mail-in applications with those received in person; extent of interviewer followup; heightened applicant awareness of "voluntary" response; use of Spanish-language application; and changes in item label as noted in recommendation 3 above.

Because of the importance of complete and accurate race/ethnic data, the operational results must be closely monitored to determine if, and to what extent, nonresponse exceeds tolerable levels. In those offices where nonresponse appears to be a problem, appropriate recommendations will be made in an effort to improve response.

The need for compliance with the OFSPS directive presented an opportunity to field test a government application prior to its actual implementation. The information obtained through the focus group interviews and the 12-office pretest made it possible for a form to be developed which incorporated the reactions and opinions of users—both applicants and district office personnel. The process should improve the quality of data obtained, an absolute necessity if program decisions are to be made based on such information.

RESEARCH AND STATISTICS NOTES, 1981

The Research and Statistics Notes are designed to get information quickly into the hands of users. These Notes may report on ongoing research, summarize preliminary findings or provide addenda to material already published. Notes published thus far in 1981 are:

Number	Title	Date
1	Benefits and Beneficiaries under Public Employee Retirement Systems, Calendar Year 1978	February 18, 1981
2	SSI Recipients in Medical Facilities Covered by Title XIX (Medicaid), December 1979	June 3, 1981
3	Social Security Farmworker Statistics, 1977	May 14, 1981
4	Public Social Welfare Expenditures, Fiscal Year 1979	June 4, 1981
5	Workers' Compensation Payments and Cost, 1979	July 27, 1981
6	Race And Ethnic Data Collection on Social Security Number Applications	August 28, 1981

If you wish to receive each issue of the Research and Statistics Notes, please send your request to the Publications Staff, Office of Policy, Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration, Room 1120, Universal North Building, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. To order by phone call: (202) 673-5209.

U.S. Department of
Health and Human Services
Social Security Administration
Office of Policy
Office of Research and Statistics
1875 Connecticut Ave., N.W
Washington, D.C. 20009

Official Business
Penalty for private use, $300

Return this sheet to above address if you do **not** want to receive this material ☐ or if change of address is needed ☐ (indicating change, including ZIP code)

SSA Publication No. 13-11701

FIRST CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF H.H.S.
PERMIT NO. G-11

FIRST CLASS

To: Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Enclosed find $ ____ (check or money order). Please enter my subscription to the **Research and Statistics Notes.** Subscription price—**$12** a year domestic, **$15** foreign. Single copies **$1.50** domestic, **$1.90** foreign; or charge to my Superintendent of Documents Deposit Account Number shown below.

Note: Prices are subject to change without notice from the Superintendent of Documents.

Credit Card Orders Only
Total charges $ – – – – – – – – – Fill in the boxes below:

Credit Card No. ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

Expiration Date Month/Year ☐☐☐☐ Master Charge Interbank No. ☐☐☐☐

Deposit Account Number ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐

5 NAME-FIRST, LAST 28

29 COMPANY NAME OR ADDITIONAL ADDRESS LINE 54 80 2

29 STREET ADDRESS 54

55 CITY 68 STATE 71 ZIP CODE 75

(or) COUNTRY

PLEASE PRINT